

From: [Rhotenberry, William](#)
To: [Mason, Steve](#); [McAteer, Mike](#); [Brescia, Nicolas](#)
Cc: [Ruhl, Christopher](#)
Subject: Re: Transition Document from Response to Remediation
Date: Monday, April 08, 2013 9:43:24 AM

The CART is made up of unified command reps. Thanks.

From: Mason, Steve
Sent: Monday, April 08, 2013 10:29:35 AM
To: Rhotenberry, William; McAteer, Mike; Brescia, Nicolas
Cc: Ruhl, Christopher
Subject: RE: Transition Document from Response to Remediation

In Table 1, the document lays out the criteria when oil will be left in place to weather naturally...

- Oil stains and coatings that do not rub off on contact may be allowed to weather and degrade naturally if there is no threat to wildlife and/or a low likelihood of re-suspension
- Inaccessible oil stains and coating may be allowed to weather and degrade naturally if removal is not readily feasible or is unsafe.
- Areas ranging up to light oiling coverage may be left to recover naturally if aggressive cleanup may cause long-term damage, i.e., no net environmental benefit would occur from removal

Who will decide on these criteria: unified command, or Exxon alone...

From: Rhotenberry, William
Sent: Monday, April 08, 2013 8:43 AM
To: Mason, Steve; McAteer, Mike; Brescia, Nicolas
Cc: Ruhl, Christopher
Subject: Transition Document from Response to Remediation

You guys want to take a quick look at this transition document and give me some comments. The necessary caveats appear to be in place for additional investigation/restoration activities as deemed necessary by trustees. Thanks.

William Rhotenberry
Federal On-Scene Coordinator
USEPA Region 6
O: 214.665.8372
M: 214.437.9804